

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed September 21, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 6-7 and 11 are allowed and that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that claims 6-7 and 11 are allowed and claim 16 contains allowable subject matter. By means of the present amendment, claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claim 16 be allowed.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 9-10, 12-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,075,587 (Lee). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5, 9-10, 12-15 and 17-19 are patentable Lee for at least the following reasons.

Lee is directed to a video display apparatus where separate display means 111 (FIG 1) is provided for display of textual information. The separate display means 111 allows viewers to watch the full picture on a separate video display area 110. As recited on column 4, lines 1-2, the separate display means 111 may be located anywhere outside the video display area 110. A special marker (280 in FIG 18, and 290 in FIG 19) may be provided for synchronizing the text with the video images. As specifically recited on column 6, lines 53-54, "the human eye cannot usually notice" the special marker.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 9 and 12, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the first part is constantly displayed on the display device for viewing by a viewer as a constant image while the second part is variably displayed on the display device for viewing by the viewer as a varying image.

A constantly displayed first part for viewing by a viewer is nowhere taught or suggested in Lee. Rather, Lee specifically recites on column 6, lines 53-54, that "the human eye cannot

usually notice" the special marker. Thus, Lee teaches away from the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 12. Further, Lee also specifically teaches to display the text on a screen which is separate from the screen where video is displayed. Thus, Lee also teaches away from display both the first and second parts on the very same display device, as recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 12.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 9 and 12 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5, 10, 13-15 and 17-22 should also be allowed based at least on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 12.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due beyond the fee for one additional independent claim, since the total number of claims is 20 (not 21) in view of canceled claim 8.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
November 24, 2006

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101